

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 HERMAN TAMRAT,
8 Plaintiff,
9 v.
10 WILLIAM KAUFMAN,
11 Defendant.

Case No. 20-cv-01324-PJH

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO STAY
AND REFERRING CASE FOR
SETTLEMENT**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 106, 108

12
13
14 Before the court is the motion of plaintiff to stay the case. See Dkt. 106. At the
15 time that the motion was filed, plaintiff was soon to be released from prison custody and
16 was without an address at which to receive mail, including court filings. See id. Since
17 that time, plaintiff has filed a notice of change of address, and stated in the notice that he
18 was “requesting the motion for stay [the] case be lifted,” as he now has an address at
19 which to receive mail. See Dkt. 107. Accordingly, plaintiff’s motion to stay the case (Dkt.
20 106) is denied as moot.

21 Plaintiff also filed a motion requesting that the court provide plaintiff with copies of
22 any documents that were mailed to his prior prison address after his release. See Dkt.
23 108. Specifically, plaintiff requests copies of any filings “between [the] dates [of]
24 December 10, 2022 to December 20, 2022, and ongoing.” See id.

25 Because no filings, other than plaintiff’s own filings, were made in the case
26 between December 10, 2022 and this current order, there were no documents mailed to
27 plaintiff’s prior address after December 10, 2022. Thus, plaintiff’s motion for copies of
28 documents (Dkt. 108) is denied as moot.

Finally, the case is re-referred to Magistrate Judge Illman for mediation or settlement proceedings to be conducted within 120 days of this order. If the case does not settle, the court will set the matter for a case management conference via videoconference.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 27, 2023

/s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton
PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California